



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

This is in direct contradiction to well recognized principles of evidence, and can only be explained in light of the modern tendency to admit all evidence more freely. *Wharton on Hom.*, Sec. 766; *Greenlf. on Ev.*, Sec. 161. In the early English case of *Rex. v. Reason*, 1 Strange 499, it was held that even prior and subsequent declarations, made the same day as the written one, were inadmissible.

FALSE IMPRISONMENT—ARREST BY ORDER OF STATE COURT AFTER DISCHARGE IN BANKRUPTCY—RELEASE ON HABEAS CORPUS AS EVIDENCE OF UNLAWFUL ARREST.—*BENNETT V. LEWIS ET AL.*, 66 S. W. 525 (Ky.).—Plaintiff to avoid arrest by defendant secured from referee in bankruptcy an order of immunity from arrest on all his debts. He was thereafter maliciously arrested and imprisoned on a judgment of State court rendered prior to his discharge in bankruptcy. *Held*, arrest not unlawful. Divided court.

As a discharge in bankruptcy does not release from all debts, plaintiff should have pleaded his discharge from the debt in question. The fact that his arrest was decided to be illegal by U. S. District Court on habeas corpus shows only that he was discharged from custody, and State court might proceed with its process until the bankruptcy proceeding was properly pleaded.

The dissenting judges strongly contend that such arrest was in defiance of the Federal court; that it was unnecessary to enumerate the debts from which he had been discharged as defendant knew he had been released from debt in question. To uphold such an arrest is to disregard judgments of U. S. courts in matters within their undoubted jurisdiction.

INSOLVENCY—EFFECT OF GENERAL ASSIGNMENT.—*IN RE HAYES*, 75 N. Y. Supp. 312.—A general assignment by a member of the New York Stock Exchange does not affect the contractual rights which members of the exchange have in the membership, so that dividends paid them as creditors out of the sale of the insolvent member's membership are not to be deducted in determining the amount for which they are entitled to dividends out of the assigned estate.

The late case of *Merrill v. Bank*, 173 U. S. 131, in which three justices very emphatically dissented, has left this point of law in an unsatisfactory state. In this case the court, following *Merrill v. Bank*, *supra*, concludes that the claim of the creditor to share in the assets of the debtor and his debt against the debtor, are distinct and separate rights. The court has ably attempted to reconcile the authorities, and the case should be of value in future controversies.

JOINT CAUSES OF ACTION—CONSTRUCTION OF WILL.—*HUGHES ET AL. V. HUGHES ET AL.*, 63 N. E. 250 (Ind.).—*Held*, that an executrix could not join in her fiduciary and individual capacity for the purpose of demanding the construction of a will. Wiley, J., dissenting.

The tendency of the law being to discourage multiplicity of suits, such joinder has generally been upheld. Thus, it was allowed for the purpose of collecting rent in *Armstrong v. Hall*, 17 How. Prac. 76, and where an executor was made defendant in an action for debt, *Day v. Stone*, 15 Abb. Prac. (N. S.) 137. The prevailing opinion is based on the rule that it is not enough that there be a common interest in the cause of action, but that there must be a common interest in the relief sought. *Martin v. Davis*, 82 Ind. 41.